THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." St. Luke, 2. 14.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1823. NO. 12.

COMMUNICATION.

FOR THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

MR. EDITOR—A solution of the following questions will be considered a favor and receive proper acknowledgments.

1. How are men *saved* by Jesus Christ?

2. If men receive a condign *punishment* for *all* their sins, what are they *forgiven*?

It is contended by Universalists that men receive a just and full punishment for all their crimes, and a complete reward for all their virtues—that Jesus Christ never has, and never will *save* any man from *deserved* punishment: consequently, if a man commit sin, he will in no wise receive any benefit by forgiveness, or by the sufferings of Christ. I know it is said that Christ *saves* men from the commission of sin; but I confess I cannot see what relation this has to the subject of *salvation*: for it is an undeniable truth that men are not saved from the commission of sin. Again, if this be all the *salvation* that men receive, or are to receive by Jesus Christ; a vast majority of the human family will never be benefited by the Saviour; inasmuch as a large majority *die* without knowing that there ever was such a person. These certainly cannot be benefitted by this salvation, unless it can be shown that men continue to *sin* in another world, and are there to receive the gospel.

It may be said that Christ *saves* men from death, that by him "life and immortality are brought to light"—that he gives to man the assurance of a resurrection from the dead. This idea is subject to some objections. The Immaterialist says, man is already in possession of immortality. If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true, the language of the Apostle that "Jesus abolished death and brought life and immortality to light," is perfectly useless: because the evident meaning of the passage is, that "life and immortality" were made manifest which were before enveloped in mystery.

I cannot therefore see what benefit Jesus will ever be to the world, if the opinion of a majority of the Universalists be correct. From their declarations, I believe they view the doctrine of *Substitution*, irrational and unscriptural. Their views however, may be incompatible with the most plain and obvious meaning of scripture. The doctrine of *vicarious suffering*, against which they say so much, may be true, though they do not believe it.

In fine, I am induced to believe that the sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ will avail but little; if a *salvation* from the *commission* of *crime*, be all the salvation he has, or will communicate: for it is believed that man *sins* as much *now*, as he did anterior to Christ's *coming*.

ERASMUS.

—

REMARKS.

The above questions of Erasmus, are truly important: they involve doctrines of the utmost consequence to the world, both with respect to faith and practice: they present a field for extensive research, and we should be highly gratified if it could be thoroughly explored by some abler pen. We feel unwilling to let this subject pass unnoticed—and while our humble endeavours are honestly made to elucidate it—we shall cherish the pleasing hope that some *light* may be thrown on a subject, which perhaps now occupies the serious hours of many reflecting minds—which has been grossly misunderstood by thousands—and which is so truly interesting to man.

That we may concisely develop this subject, we shall take several positions for granted; holding ourselves in readiness to prove any position we may take, if it should be called in question. We wish to be understood that we shall cheerfully relinquish any assumed truth that we cannot maintain.

We shall first attempt to show what *Salvation* is.

Salvation has been erroneously supposed to consist in a deliverance from a state of interminable suffering which man justly deserves—or from the infinite *anger* of God, which anger man has excited by transgression.

To this view of the subject of salvation, we object, for the following reasons: 1. It supposes man justly exposed to a degree and duration of misery which God has not revealed in his word. The Parent of the Universe has never made a revelation of *endless misery*, as the inheritance of his *children*! For the doctrine of an endless hell, we are in-

debted to Paganism and Tradition!

2. This idea supposes infinite anger in God, which in reality never did, and never can exist.

3. It supposes feeble, finite man capable of changeing the mind of Jehovah & rendering the Author of his existence, infinitely *miserable*, by exciting in his mind infinite *anger!* We presume none will pretend that any intelligent being can be happy, while exercised with the most malevolent and revengeful *passion.*

4. It denies the justice of God, by supposing that he will let the *guilty* go free.

Having shown that the popular opinion concerning SALVATION cannot be correct, we will now endeavour to show what salvation is.

Salvation in the present tense, is the deliverance of man from the love and practice of sin; and consequently from the punishment which would have been deserved, and must have been inflicted; if the sin, from which man is *saved*, had been committed — This salvation is effected by the love of God and our fellow-creatures—by the knowledge of truth—the love and practice of *moral virtue.* If all punishment be designed for the *good* of those who are punished, (which we think can be proved,) then it follows, that if God should *save* a man from the punishment which he deserves, he would prevent his receiving the *good* which was designed, and which would have been received, if the punishment had been inflicted! To pretend that God saves man from *deserved* punishment, would be denying the *goodness* of God; by saying, either, that God never intended punishment for the *good* of man, or that God himself deprives man of the *good* he designed for him, by withholding that punishment which would do the sinner *good!*

The scripture warrants this view of salvation: see St. Math. 1. 21, "And thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he shall save his people FROM their *sins.*"

If the religion of Christ be incapable of producing any degree of salvation in this world, by giving the knowledge of divine truth—by exciting love to God and man—by presenting moral holiness in all its native charms—and increasing human happiness: if the only happy effects of religion be placed beyond the reach of man while on this side of the grave: why did the all-wise and most merciful Creator, ever introduce into *this world*, a religion which cannot possibly benefit his children in the *same* world into which he has introduced it?

If the unfading realities and glories of eternity must be presented to the human mind, before any of the blessed effects of gospel grace can be received; why was not the revelation of the gospel, reserved for those eternal, and to us, invisible scenes?

We contend that religion is a *present* good—some degree of salvation is enjoyed.—Thousands, "heavy laden" with cares and woes, in Christ have found "rest to their souls." Millions can experimentally witness that the Yoke of Christ is easy, and his burden is light. See St. Math. 11. 28. 29. 30.

Salvation perfect and complete, is a deliverance from all sin, temptation, suffering and death, into the enjoyment of life, immortality, incorruptibility and endless glory! This is "the GIFT of God." This is the rich inheritance of ALL mankind—willed to us by our Father in Heaven—and communicated through Jesus Christ—the EXECUTOR of the divine WILL—"the SAVIOUR of the WORLD." 1 John 5. 10. 11. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, AND THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON." In the above passage are the *two* classes, *believer* and *unbeliever.* God hath GIVEN eternal life to both classes—to ALL mankind: this glorious truth, all men are called upon to *believe*, consequently it must be truth, otherwise God calls on mankind to believe that which is not *true! Faith* can never create its object. That which man is called upon to *believe*, must be as *true* before he *believes* it, as *afterwards.* On the contrary unbelief cannot *destroy* the TRUTH. "He that believeth hath the *witness* in himself." The believer knows the truth and enjoys salvation. "He that believeth not maketh him" (i. e. God) "a liar." The unbeliever is destitute of the truth—destitute of the enjoyment of spiritual life—but how could his unbelief make God a liar, if God had not given him eternal life? If God hath not given eternal life to the unbeliever, and if the unbeliever should believe that God had given him eternal life, he would believe that which is *false!* "This is the record that God hath given us ETERNAL LIFE, and THIS LIFE IS IN HIS SON." Eternal life is in the Son of God—man can neither *create* nor *destroy* it! The sooner mankind know this most sublime truth, the sooner will they love God supremely, and their neighbours as themselves. This is "GLAD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY WHICH SHALL BE UNTO ALL PEOPLE!"

If the view of salvation already given, be correct; then it becomes indispensably necessary to explain *forgiveness* in such man-

ner as will comport with divine truth—lest we fall into the absurdity of setting one part of the scriptures at variance with another, and thereby invalidate the whole. Either *forgiveness* must be explained and understood in such a manner as to admit of the sinner's receiving *all* the punishment he *justly* deserves, or we must suppose that the sinner is saved in *violation* of justice, and that the numerous passages of scripture which declare that "God shall render to *every* man according to his works," are *not true!* Men, by exercising *forgiveness*, may perhaps, relinquish the punishment they *intended* to inflict: but God never alters his *purposes*, nor *changes* his *intentions*. *Forgiveness* with God is the display of the eternal benignity of his nature—the manifestation of his everlasting goodness to sinners. *Forgiveness* is ever with God, and forbids his casting off forever on account of sin. The scriptures confirm this view of forgiveness. Ps. 99. 8. "Thou wast a God that *forgavest* them, though thou tookest *vengeance* of their inventions." This clearly shows that God can forgive sinners, tho' he punish them *all* they *deserve*, and all that will do them *good*.

We are now prepared to answer the questions of Erasmus.

1. "How are men saved by Jesus Christ?" Answer, by being in some degree *saved* or *delivered* from ignorance, vice and consequent misery in this world; and finally perfected in a spiritual, holy and immortal existence through Christ, who is "the RESURRECTION and the LIFE!"

2. "If men receive a condign punishment for all their sins, what are they forgiven?" Answer, they are forgiven all their sins, by being made the subjects of the all-conquering influence of divine grace, after having been subjected to the righteous and salutary discipline of the greatest and best of Beings, the most faithful of all Friends. But they cannot be so *forgiven* any sin, as to prevent their receiving the *good* intended for them, or violate immutable, eternal justice, or invalidate the scriptures of truth.

Universalists contend that men receive a just reward for all their vices and all their virtues; This salutary doctrine is rendered consistent with SALVATION, by limiting all human actions within a *finite* sphere.

Calvinists and Arminians suppose sin deserves *endless* punishment—they admit that all mankind are sinners—and that the scriptures teach that God will deal with all men according to their deserts—and if they were *consistent*, they would believe in *universal eternal* DAMNATION!!!

Erasmus says, "I know it is said, that Christ saves men from the commission of sin; but I confess I cannot see what relation this has to the subject of SALVATION: for it is an undeniable truth that men are not saved from the commission of sin."

If saving men from the commission of sin have no relation to *Salvation*, we confess ourselves unacquainted with the subject—and if it be an undeniable truth that men are not perfectly and entirely saved from the commission of sin, while in this state of being, still if they be in any, even the least degree, saved from the commission of sin by the power of truth and divine love, then what we have advanced on the subject, is substantiated; and saving from the commission of sin, has the most intimate connexion with salvation—it is salvation itself. We presume E. will not contend that men are in no degree saved from sin by the power of the gospel—Rom. 8. 24. 'For we are saved by hope.' Tit. 3. 5. According to his mercy he saved us.' Many similar passages might be adduced, but these are sufficient.

The idea 'that man *sins* as much now, as he did anterior to Christ's coming,' is a supposition which requires proof, before it can be admitted; especially as it stands directly opposed to all those passages of scripture which speak of Salvation in the present tense.

Erasmus says, 'if this be all the salvation that men receive, or are to receive by Jesus Christ; a vast majority of the human family will never be benefited by the Saviour; inasmuch as a vast majority *die* whithout knowing that there ever was such a person.'

Though salvation always includes a deliverance from the commission of sin, yet we by no means believe that the degree of salvation communicated to some, in this life, by the gospel, is *all* the salvation that mankind are to receive by Jesus Christ; for we have already proved that *eternal life* is given to all men in *Christ*, consequently this valuable inheritance does not belong exclusively to those who are benefited by the gospel in this life; but it belongs to every human being—and will ultimately be enjoyed by all; 'For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ *shall all be made alive*! 1. Cor. 15. 22.

The philosophical question relative to materiality or immateriality, we consider entirely aside from the subject of our present discussion. The most learned and wise have differed in their opinions relative to man's present constitution and nature; and many believers in christianity may be found on either side of this question. If man's present constitution, composition and nature, be wholly material, elementary, mortal and perishable; if the grasp of death produce

entire unconsciousness, and a perfect negation of all life; still by the gospel of 'LIFE and IMMORTALITY, we have the joyful assurance that the voice of Omnipotence shall awaken man from the profound slumbers of the grave; that the mandate of Jehovah shall summon earth's numerous millions from the regions of dust and silence, clothe them with the habiliments of immortality, and crown them with ENDLESS LIFE! 'For as we have borne the image of the *earthy*, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly' nature.

On the contrary, if man in this mode of existence, possess two constituent principles of being, the one *mortal*, the other *immortal*, if his body, formed of the dust, be but the receptacle of his spirit, intelligence or moral faculties, which emanate from Divinity; if in the natural constitution of his spiritual existence, he be allied to the eternal Father of the spirits of all flesh, by an affinity which death cannot sever, and which shall triumph over the grave; then 'if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved; we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;' thus 'death is swallowed up in victory,' and all intelligent creation 'delivered from the bondage of corruption,' and encircled in the arms of eternal, unbounded BENEFICENCE.

Erasmus says, 'If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, be true; the language of the Apostle that 'Jesus abolished death and brought life and immortality to light,' is perfectly useless, because the evident meaning of the passage is, that 'life and immortality' were made manifest, which were before enveloped in mystery.'

The above inference, we think entirely incorrect; for "if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true," if this truth were enveloped in *mystery*, and if Christ did not *create* immortality, but made void, or "abolished death," and divested the grave of its terror and its victory, by simply bearing witness to this eternal and glorious TRUTH; then the language of the Apostle, so far from being "useless," contains the most consoling and important intelligence to every child of mortality, to every victim of death!

Erasmus says, "I believe they" (the Universalists,) "view the doctrine of SUBSTITUTION, irrational and unscriptural." We do; and we pledge ourselves to prove it both irrational and unscriptural. E. also says "the doctrine of *vicarious suffering*, against which they" (the Universalists,) "say so much, may be true, tho' they do not believe it." Granted. But we challenge any, or every created being, to prove it TRUE! If it can be proved true, we will receive it; if it cannot, it ought to be relinquished and rejected by every christain.

The doctrine of vicarious suffering, *substitution* or *imputation*, supposes that Christ received the punishment, justly due to sinners—and on the contrary that the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed, or transfered to sinners, who are thereby made righteous. This doctrine is founded on those passages of scripture which contain language similar to the following. 1 Pet. 2. 24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree—by whose stripes ye were healed."

Among our reasons for rejecting this doctrine, are the following: 1. It is a total derogation and violation of moral righteousness, to punish the *innocent* for the crimes of the *guilty*. 2. It is perfectly absurd to suppose that *guilt* or *righteousness* is transferable from one moral being to another. Guilt can no more be transfered, than existence! 3. If the doctrine of imputation be true, then there can be no necessity for the sinner to suffer for his own sin; unless our Creator requires a double portion of suffering, first of an innocent substitute, then of the sinner himself. 4. It is expressly contrary to the numerous passages of scripture which declare that God will not punish the innocent, nor let the guilty go free—that "the wickedness of the wicked SHALL be upon *him*."

What terrible effects would be produced if the irrational theory of *substitution*, should be reduced to practice in civil society! Who does not see the injustice of inflicting on an innocent being, the punishment due to the guilty? The willingness of the sufferer to endure the penalties of sin, with a view of delivering the criminal therefrom, can never alter the *injustice* of such proceedings.

The *death* of Christ was the seal to his mission of mercy; but we may as well argue that we are saved by the LIFE of Christ; as that we are saved by his DEATH, Rom. 5. 10. "We shall be saved by his LIFE"

By the same rule by which we can prove that Christ was righteous, suffered and died *for* us, i. e. in our stead: we may also prove that he has gone to heaven for us, i. e. in our stead; consequently we have no part nor lot in this matter! Heb. 9. 24. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places &c.—but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God FOR US!"

By the same rule by which we can prove that Christ literally bore our sins by imputation, we may prove that he bore our natural diseases, and consequently that mankind spend their mortal existence in perfect health. St. Math. 8. 16. 17. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were

possessed with devils; and he cast out the pirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our SICKNESSES!" O how long will the christian world make shipwreck of common sense!

All those passages of holy Writ which speak of Christ's suffering *for* us, bearing our sins, &c. are necessarily figurative, and are happily illustrated by reference to a very natural, and perfectly clear similitude: viz. the manner in which a physician cures the sick. Does a physician cure the sick by taking the disease to himself? We might as reasonably contend for this idea, as to contend that the great Physician of souls, cures our moral maladies, by taking sin, or its punishment to himself!

We ought all to know that we must and do suffer for our own sins: hence it is of the utmost importance that we should regulate our lives by the pure precepts of the gospel of Christ: for "he that doeth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous." 1. John 3. 7.

ED.

THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1823.

The first of the two following letters to the Rev. John Dempster, was written at the date which it bears, and was received by him; but he has not *condescended* to reply.

The fulminations of Orthodoxy, *alias* Limitarianism—will ever fall harmlessly at the feet of conscious integrity; while those who impotently attempt to wield the convolving thunders of Omnipotent, unmerciful vengeance, pertinaciously refuse to vindicate, or even *attempt* to vindicate their contracted, merciless schemes!

How perfectly appropriate is the following passage of sacred Writ! Isa. 41, 28, 29. "For I beheld, and there was no man; even among them, and there was no counsellor, that, when I asked of them, could answer a word: behold, they are all vanity; their works are nothing: their molten images are wind and confusion!!"

—

Watertown, Dec. 19, 1822.

REV. SIR,

The intellectual powers of man are bestowed upon him, by the infinitely benificent Parent of his existence, for the obvious purpose of their *exercise* in drawing consolation and instruction from the exhaustless fountain of Truth; in the amelioration of his condition; and in all the duties of social life.

As no subject can be of greater importance, so none can have greater claims to our most serious attention; than the religion of Jesus Christ and the spiritual welfare of mankind. With a view to promote knowledge, in the mutual exercise of that charity which "never faileth," I feel disposed to correspond with you, Sir, respecting the discourse you delivered last Sabbath from Rom. 12, 3. My particular object is, to request an explanation of the following language, used in your discourse. In speaking of infidelity, you said, "I mean not the *broad* infidel, I mean those who do away *mystery* from the Bible, who explain scripture according to pre-conceived ideas of the extended mercy of God and according to particular ideas of divine justice." Now, Sir, I am utterly unable to attach any meaning to the above quoted language, unless you meant to unchristianize a certain class, who receive the scriptures as a Revelation from God. If you did not mean this, you would do me a favour to inform me what you did mean. I am of opinion, that infidelity is a disbelief of christianity: and I think it a very extraordinary and unwarrantable position, for any denomination, to deny to another, the name of christian, merely because they do not understand the meaning of the inspired testimony alike!

If this rule should once be adopted, every sect might brand every other sect with the odious appellation of *Infidel*; and each receive in their turn the same measure they dealt out to others!

This uncharitable practice would present the christian world in a most ridiculous point of light. If you meant what your words import, have I not reason to believe you meant to deny Universalists the name of *christian*, when you spake of a certian class of Infidels, (in contradistinction to "*broad* Infidels,") "who explain scripture according to pre-conceived ideas of the extended mercy of God," &c. What denomination have so *extensive* ideas of God's mercy as Universalists, who believe that "the Lord is good to *all*, and his tender mercies over *all* his works?" I confess sir, it would give me much satisfaction, to learn that I did not understand you correctly, and that you are willing to allow that Universalists are christians.

With respect to "doing away *mystery* from the Bible," I have only to inquire whether you think that a *mystery* is the object of *faith*. A mystery is something above human intelligence, and as faith rests on evidence, it appears that a mystery is not the object of faith; unless a man may believe that, of which he has no knowledge. When

entire unconsciousness, and a perfect negation of all life; still by the gospel of 'LIFE and IMMORTALITY, we have the joyful assurance that the voice of Omnipotence shall awaken man from the profound slumbers of the grave; that the mandate of Jehovah shall summon earth's numerous millions from the regions of dust and silence, clothe them with the habiliments of immortality, and crown them with ENDLESS LIFE! 'For as we have borne the image of the *earthy*, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly' nature.

On the contrary, if man in this mode of existence, possess two constituent principles of being, the one *mortal*, the other *immortal*, if his body, formed of the dust, be but the receptacle of his spirit, intelligence or moral faculties, which emanate from Divinity; if in the natural constitution of his spiritual existence, he be allied to the eternal Father of the spirits of all flesh, by an affinity which death cannot sever, and which shall triumph over the grave; then 'if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved; we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens;' thus 'death is swallowed up in victory,' and all intelligent creation 'delivered from the bondage of corruption,' and encircled in the arms of eternal, unbounded BENEFICENCE.

Erasmus says, 'If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, be true; the language of the Apostle that 'Jesus abolished death and brought life and immortality to light,' is perfectly useless, because the evident meaning of the passage is, that 'life and immortality' were made manifest, which were before enveloped in mystery.'

The above inference, we think entirely incorrect; for "if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true," if this truth were enveloped in *mystery*, and if Christ did not *create* immortality, but made void, or "abolished death," and divested the grave of its terror and its victory, by simply bearing witness to this eternal and glorious TRUTH; then the language of the Apostle, so far from being "useless," contains the most consoling and important intelligence to every child of mortality, to every victim of death!

Erasmus says, "I believe they" (the Universalists,) "view the doctrine of SUBSTITUTION, irrational and unscriptural." We do; and we pledge ourselves to prove it both irrational and unscriptural. E. also says "the doctrine of *vicarious suffering*, against which they" (the Universalists,) "say so much, may be true, tho' they do not believe it." Granted. But we challenge any, or every created being, to prove it TRUE! If it can be proved true, we will receive it; if it cannot, it ought to be relinquished and rejected by every christain.

The doctrine of vicarious suffering, *substitution* or *imputation*, supposes that Christ received the punishment, justly due to sinners—and on the contrary that the perfect righteousness of Christ is imputed, or transfered to sinners, who are thereby made righteous. This doctrine is founded on those passages of scripture which contain language similar to the following. 1 Pet. 2. 24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree—by whose stripes ye were healed."

Among our reasons for rejecting this doctrine, are the following: 1. It is a total derogation and violation of moral righteousness, to punish the *innocent* for the crimes of the *guilty*. 2. It is perfectly absurd to suppose that *guilt* or *righteousness* is transferable from one moral being to another. Guilt can no more be transfered, than existence! 3. If the doctrine of imputation be true, then there can be no necessity for the sinner to suffer for his own sin; unless our Creator requires a double portion of suffering, first of an innocent substitute, then of the sinner himself. 4. It is expressly contrary to the numerous passages of scripture which declare that God will not punish the innocent, nor let the guilty go free—that "the wickedness of the wicked SHALL be upon *him*."

What terrible effects would be produced if the irrational theory of *substitution*, should be reduced to practice in civil society! Who does not see the injustice of inflicting on an innocent being, the punishment due to the guilty? The willingness of the sufferer to endure the penalties of sin, with a view of delivering the criminal therefrom, can never alter the *injustice* of such proceedings.

The *death* of Christ was the seal to his mission of mercy; but we may as well argue that we are saved by the LIFE of Christ; as that we are saved by his DEATH, Rom. 5. 10. "We shall be saved by his LIFE"

By the same rule by which we can prove that Christ was righteous, suffered and died *for* us, i. e. in our stead: we may also prove that he has gone to heaven for us, i. e. in our stead; consequently we have no part nor lot in this matter! Heb. 9. 24. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places &c.—but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God FOR US!"

By the same rule by which we can prove that Christ literally bore our sins by imputation, we may prove that he bore our natural diseases, and consequently that mankind spend their mortal existence in perfect health. St. Math. 8. 16. 17. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were

possessed with devils; and he cast out the pirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our SICKNESSES!" O how long will the christian world make shipwreck of common sense!

All those passages of holy Writ which speak of Christ's suffering *for* us, bearing our sins, &c. are necessarily figurative, and are happily illustrated by reference to a very natural, and perfectly clear similitude: viz. the manner in which a physician cures the sick. Does a physician cure the sick by taking the disease to himself? We might as reasonably contend for this idea, as to contend that the great Physician of souls, cures our moral maladies, by taking sin, or its punishment to himself!

We ought all to know that we must and do suffer for our own sins: hence it is of the utmost importance that we should regulate our lives by the pure precepts of the gospel of Christ: for "he that doeth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous." 1. John 3. 7. ED.

THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1823.

The first of the two following letters to the Rev. John Dempster, was written at the date which it bears, and was received by him; but he has not *condescended* to reply.

The fulminations of Orthodoxy, *alias* Limitarianism—will ever fall harmlessly at the feet of conscious integrity; while those who impotently attempt to wield the convolving thunders of Omnipotent, unmerciful vengeance, pertinaciously refuse to vindicate, or even *attempt* to vindicate their contracted, merciless schemes!

How perfectly appropriate is the following passage of sacred Writ! Isa. 41, 28, 29. "For I beheld, and there was no man; even among them, and there was no counsellor, that, when I asked of them, could answer a word: behold, they are all vanity; their works are nothing: their molten images are wind and confusion!!"

—

Watertown, Dec. 19, 1822.

REV. SIR,

The intellectual powers of man are bestowed upon him, by the infinitely benificent Parent of his existence, for the obvious purpose of their *exercise* in drawing consolation and instruction from the exhaustless fountain of Truth; in the amelioration of his condition; and in all the duties of social life.

As no subject can be of greater importance, so none can have greater claims to our most serious attention; than the religion of Jesus Christ and the spiritual welfare of mankind. With a view to promote knowledge, in the mutual exercise of that charity which "never faileth," I feel disposed to correspond with you, Sir, respecting the discourse you delivered last Sabbath from Rom. 12, 3. My particular object is, to request an explanation of the following language, used in your discourse. In speaking of infidelity, you said, "I mean not the *broad* infidel, I mean those who do away *mystery* from the Bible, who explain scripture according to pre-conceived ideas of the extended mercy of God and according to particular ideas of divine justice." Now, Sir, I am utterly unable to attach any meaning to the above quoted language, unless you meant to unchristianize a certain class, who receive the scriptures as a Revelation from God. If you did not mean this, you would do me a favour to inform me what you did mean. I am of opinion, that infidelity is a disbelief of christianity: and I think it a very extraordinary and unwarrantable position, for any denomination, to deny to another, the name of christian, merely because they do not understand the meaning of the inspired testimony alike!

If this rule should once be adopted, every sect might brand every other sect with the odious appellation of *Infidel*; and each receive in their turn the same measure they dealt out to others!

This uncharitable practice would present the christian world in a most ridiculous point of light. If you meant what your words import, have I not reason to believe you meant to deny Universalists the name of *christian*, when you spake of a certian class of Infidels, (in contradistinction to "*broad* Infidels,") "who explain scripture according to pre-conceived ideas of the extended mercy of God," &c. What denomination have so *extensive* ideas of God's mercy as Universalists, who believe that "the Lord is good to *all*, and his tender mercies over *all* his works?" I confess sir, it would give me much satisfaction, to learn that I did not understand you correctly, and that you are willing to allow that Universalists are christians.

With respect to "doing away *mystery* from the Bible," I have only to inquire whether you think that a *mystery* is the object of *faith*. A mystery is something above human intelligence, and as faith rests on evidence, it appears that a mystery is not the object of faith; unless a man may believe that, of which he has no knowledge. When

a mystery is revealed, it may be believed, but it no longer remains a mystery. If I mistake not, the word mystery is used upwards of twenty times in the New Testament, in such manner as to show that it is something which, though it had been unknown, yet it might be, or had been revealed and made known. You will observe Sir, that I do not say, there are no mysteries in the Bible; I only say that in the sense in which any thing is a mystery, in the same sense it cannot be the subject of faith or belief.

Wishing to receive any additional light which you may possess on this subject, desiring that you will favour me with a reply explaining what you stated concerning Infidels, and praying that you may be blessed temporally, spiritually and eternally, I am dear Sir, with sentiments of esteem yours in sincerity. PITT MORSE.

Rev. John Dempster.

TO THE REV. JOHN DEMPSTER.

Dear Sir,

Having yesterday heard your funeral discourse from the language of Christ, recorded in St. Luke 22d chap. last clause of verse 42d, "Not my will, but thine be done." I feel deeply impressed with a sense of duty, while I offer a few remarks upon your discourse. Feeling the influence of that charity which the gospel inculcates, I hope Sir, you will receive this communication with the same spirit in which it is written.

I was highly gratified with the faithfulness and success, with which you administered consolation to the afflicted—this is in imitation of our benevolent Saviour, who was anointed of the divine spirit, "to comfort all that *mourn*."

But in endeavouring to illustrate your text, you advanced some positions and made some statements which I think cannot be substantiated: if you think otherwise, the columns of the Herald are at your service.

1. You endeavoured to support the idea that God possesses two wills, the one absolute, the other contingent. His *absolute* will you understood to be the eternal, immutable law by which the Universe is governed, comprehending ALL that GOD himself performs. His *contingent* will you supposed to be suspended upon the free agency of rational beings. His *absolute* will, the united powers of universal existence and intelligence cannot frustrate; but his *contingent* will you think may be, and often is utterly *frustrated*. In support of this last idea, you quoted two passages of scripture: the one in St. Math. the other in Rev. "How often *would* I have gathered you &c.—but ye *would* not." "I *would* that thou wert cold or hot." Permit me Sir, to inform you that you made a very great mistake in refering those passages to the Almighty, with a view of showing that his *will* is frustrated by creatures entirely *dependent* on Him! It is not GOD who personally speaks in either of those passages—it is the SON of GOD—"the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the *creation* of GOD." That Christ has a *will* distinct from his Father, and in subjection to it, is demonstrated by your text, "not my *will*, but thine be done." If Christ possess no other *will* than God, or if he be God, as Trinitarians contend, what does this text signify? Would it make good sense to read it thus, "NOT MY WILL, BUT MY WILL BE DONE?"

You stated that the *contingency* of the divine will, with respect to free agents, is compatible with the divine prescience, because God knows the result of human agency, equally as well when he first suspends his *will* upon their *freedom*; as after *free agency* has been exercised in performing every action which will ever be done by man. Now Sir, if God perfectly and *certainly* knows that a *free* agent will perform a certain action, at a certain period of time, or at a certain *point* in eternity; where is the *contingency* with God! Will you pretend that God may *know* a thing, and not know it *certainly*? Or will you say that what God knows to be *certain*, is nevertheless *contingent* with Him?

Another idea you advanced is, that all idiots and infants will be saved. Granting this to be correct, I wish to inquire whether it would not have been far better for the millions of the human race who are to groan in the liquid flames of hopeless damnation and endless woe, if they had never possessed moral and rational powers, or if their Creator had called them from the regions of mortality while in infancy? How Sir do you account for the notion that God CURSES his children with intelligence, or with a protracted mortal existence, when He perfectly and *certainly* knows that they will thereby become inexpressibly miserable to the never ending ages of eternity?

Another extraordinary particular in your discourse, was the following: you quoted the words of Solomon, "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." This text you heard me quote this week in a public discourse; when according to the plain import of the language, I made a universal application of it. After quoting Solomon's words, you made the following remark—"The rebellious delight to quote such passages, break them from their connexion, and *rashly* apply them to all mankind, not even excepting the saints." If I were to re-

bellious' in quoting that text, was not Solomon 'rebellious' in writing it? Was he not rebellious in not excepting the *saints*? Solomon says, 'There is not a just man upon earth,' (not even excepting Br. Dempster,) "that doeth good, and sinneth not." However humiliating it may be, I can quote many other passages of scripture, which, if they prove any thing, prove even you Sir to be a sinner.

I address this letter to you Sir, not because I expect you will ever answer it, but because I love the truth, and wish to promote it. If you should see fit to answer this, it shall be published: if not, the public will probably *conjecture* why you have not.

God is my witness, that in all I have written, I have honestly aimed at truth, and that I entertain no unfriendly feeling towards you; but feel cheerfully to exercise that charity which never faileth and which is due to a fellow creature, a fellow heir of immortal felicity.

Very respectfully yours.
PITT MORSE.

Watertown, April 19th 1823.

P. S. Happy is it for creation, that the throne of Omnipotent, boundless mercy can never be usurped by a petty reptile of mortality! If such a being could once attain the sceptre of universal dominion, thunderbolts of endless vengeance would be hurled far and near—creation would be clad in the sable mantle of lamentation and mourning, and millions hurried to the regions of utter destruction and interminable woe!

From the Boston U. Magazine.

"And the head of Dagon, and both the palms of his hands, were cut off upon the threshold; only the stump of Dagon was left to him."—1 Sam. v. 4.

Several things have for some time been considered rather strange, and hard to be accounted for. Orthodoxy, which in former times carried its head so very erect and gracefully; and could see every thing so plainly, even light was unnecessary to its seeing all things, could hear so quickly that it could plainly distinguish cases where there were no sounds, and could speak with an eloquence that no mortal could understand, seems of late to have no head, sees nothing, hears nothing, and says nothing! In former times too, this famous idol could use its hands, both right and left, with an astonishing activity, and whoever had the temerity not to pay him the highest honors was sure to feel their weight and that most severely. But for some time this idol seems to have no hands; it can do nothing; and people can walk past it without paying it the least respect, and he raises not a hand against them! Yet there seems to be a bulky mass of something that has neither head nor hands which, perhaps, we may call its stump.

Now the reason of this, so great a change, is, the Ark of the covenant of God has been brought near to this idol, and he has fallen before it.

H. B.

ANECDOTES.

A zealous Calvinist, in preaching from the 26th verse of the 73d Psalm, introduced his subject by observing, that *holy David* was a bright *example* of what every Christian on earth *ought to be*. He said David was afflicted and troubled like all other children of God, and that his righteous soul was most *vexed* and *plagued*, when he beheld the prosperity of the wicked, and he would have *enenvied their situation* and murmured against God, had he not been made acquainted with their final end. But when he saw them standing on slippery places, just ready to plunge into the lake of fire and brimstone, which flamed below, he was *satisfied*, and willing to endure a few more sorrows. The preacher told his brethren, they must take *comfort* and double their patience; for *all* the *blessings* which God bestowed on the wicked, were *but curses in disguise*, designed to dazzle their eyes with the prospect of good, till suddenly, there would break from beneath them a volcanic eruption, and swallow them alive in the pains of hell forever. Now, said the preacher, dear brethren, *we* are no better by nature than the wicked, and *this moment as much deserve* to be damned! O what a wonder! what a wonder it is that a God of *infinite* wisdom, infinite *goodness*, and infinite power, should save *one* such hell deserving creature! And what a miracle of miracles it will be, when our God saves *all* the righteous!!

In a certain town in Connecticut three young *Methodists*, who had lately "got religion," visited the shop of a Universalist, and by their rueful countenances seemed to be unusually pious. The Universalist observing the gloom of Methodism depicted on their faces, took up his Testament, and thus accosted them—"Gentlemen, this is a *Universalist* Testament; with your consent I will read you a few sentences. He then read several passages which he thought favoured the doctrine of Universalism. The young triumvirate began to exhibit manifest signs of uneasiness. The Universalist continued to read; they grew more & more alarmed, and eyed the reader with most frightful physiognomy. He read on; they could endure it no longer, but fled, verifying the

proverb, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth." To complete the farce, these three spiritual-born converts, near the same neighborhood, reported, that a certain Universalist had been reading to them his *Universalist* testament, and that it contained the most abominable falsehoods they ever heard!

POETRY.

RELIGION.

By Montgomery.

Through shades and solitude profound,
The fainting traveller winds his way;
Bewildering meteors glare around,
And tempt his wandering feet astray.

Welcome, thrice welcome, to his eye,
The sudden Moon's inspiring light,
When forth she sallies through the sky,
The guardian angel of the Night.

Thus mortals, blind and weak, below,
Pursue the phantom bliss in vain;
The world's a wilderness of woe,
And life a pilgrimage of pain.

Till mild RELIGION, from above,
Descends, a sweet engaging form
The messenger of heavenly love,
The bow of promise in a storm.

Then guilty passions wing their flight,
Sorrow, remorse, affliction, cease;
Religion's yoke is soft and light;
And all her paths, are paths of peace.

Ambition, pride, revenge, depart;
And folly flees her chastening rod;
She makes the humble, contrite heart,
The temple of the living God.

Beyond the narrow vale of time,
Where bright, celestial ages roll:
To scenes eternal, scenes sublime,
She points the way, and leads the soul.

At her approach, the grave appears
The gate of paradise, restored:
Her voice the watching cherub hears,
And drops the double flaming sword.

Baptized with her unerring fire,
May we the crown of glory gain,
Rise when the host of heaven expire,
And reign with God, forever reign.

OBITUARY.

DIED, at Rome, N. Y. April 16th 1823, *Mr. Hope Smith*, father of the Rev. S. R. Smith, aged 72 years and 7 months. In life, honest and industrious; in sickness, patient and resigned to the will of Heaven: he died in full hope of inheriting a happy immortality with all the family of man.

At Alexandria, on the 22d ult. *Mr. Asa Gates Jr.* in the 24th year of his age. He was instantaneously killed by the fall of a tree.

Drowned, in Black River, near this Village, on the 25th ult. *Mr. Horace Story*, about 18 years of age.

In Providence, (R. I.) on Saturday 15th ult. *Samuel James*, Esq. in the 71st year of his age. He had been for a great length of time, much afflicted in his breast; and on the evening of his decease he had exerted himself much, in packing up his most valuable furniture (it being during a fire) after which he sat down in a chair and in a few moments expired. The widow mourns the loss of a kind husband and the children, a tender parent. He was a constant attendant (when able) on public worship at the Universalist chapel in that place, to the erection of which, and to a stated ministry, he was much devoted, and liberal.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Whereas the "Christian Herald," printed in New-York, published, some time since, what was called, an account of the "Conversion of a Universalist," named "Mr. A." in this city, which account has been republished in Philadelphia, in the shape of a Tract; and whereas the publishers of the said conversion have repeatedly been called upon for the name and residence of the said "Mr. A." and no information has been obtained; we, therefore, offer a liberal reward, to any person or persons, who shall produce the name and residence of the said "Mr. A." so that he can speak for himself, and prove the truth of the said account; until when, we shall pronounce it a fabrication and falsehood.

N. B. Numerous and well authenticated accounts, giving names and residences, of persons converted from the errors of Calvinism, Hopkinsianism, and Arminianism, to the faith of Universal Salvation. as preached in the Scriptures, will be gratuitously furnished at short notice; on condition they shall be published in the "Christian Herald," and the favour shall be reciprocated!

N. Y. Gospel Herald.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

*****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.